

REMARKS

In the Office Action, Claims 1 to 11, 14 to 39, 42 to 67, 70 to 95, 98 to 113, 115, 117 and 119 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for alleged indefiniteness. In general, the Office Action essentially repeats the § 112 rejection from the Office Action dated January 5, 2007, and thus variously asserts that it is unclear whether phrases such as "received information" or "detected printing device" refer to information received in a receiving step, a printing device detected in a detecting step, and so on.

This rejection is traversed. In particular, the Office Action does not respond to the previous traversal of the § 112 rejection, as required by MPEP § 707.07(f). MPEP 707.07(f) states that "Where the applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner should, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant's argument and answer the substance of it." Applicants clearly traversed this rejection in the Amendment And Statement Of Substance Of Interview dated April 5, 2007, but the Office Action does not respond to, or even mention, the arguments advanced therein. Accordingly, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn for this reason alone.

Moreover, Applicants re-assert and incorporate herein the traversal as articulated in the prior Amendment. In particular, Applicants again respectfully submit that this claim language is sufficiently clear, and that those of ordinary skill in the art would clearly understand which elements are being referred to in the claims. In fact, it is believed that the objected-to phrases (e.g., the received information, the detected printing

device) actually clarify the functionality of the invention, by illustrating how the elements of the invention are linked between the different steps or units of the invention.

Withdrawal of the § 112 rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 1, 29, 57 and 85 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over European Patent No. 952513 (White), U.S. Patent No. 6,678,068 (Richter) and the background of the invention (AAPA) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,930,465 (Bellucco). The remaining claims are dependent, and were rejected as above, or further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,820,124 (Clough) or U.S. Patent No. 6,628,413 (Lee). The rejections are traversed, as explained more fully below.

The present invention generally concerns the management of printing queues on a network. Queues are created and published to a network based on information received from a printing device and queue policy rules entered by a system administrator. According to one aspect of the invention, it is the system administrator that designates a maximum number of printing devices to be supported. According to a further aspect, a print queue is not created for a printing device once an existing number of print queues has reached the administrator-designated maximum number.

By virtue of this arrangement, it is ordinarily possible for a system administrator to have more control over the printing workload and printer queue access.

Referring specifically to claim language, independent Claim 1 is directed to a method for managing print queues for a plurality of printing devices connected on a network. The method includes detecting a printing device connected on the network, requesting configuration information from the detected printing device, receiving the

requested configuration information from the printing device, entering policy rules that govern how print queues are created and published, wherein the policy rules are entered by a system administrator, accessing the policy rules, creating a print queue for the printing device based on the received configuration information and based on the accessed policy rules, and publishing the print queue to the network according to the accessed policy rules. The system administrator designates a maximum number of printing devices to be supported, and a print queue is not created for a printing device once an existing number of print queues has reached the designated maximum number.

Independent Claims 29, 57 and 85 are directed to a device, computer-executable process steps and a computer readable medium, respectively, substantially in accordance with the method of Claim 1.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest the features of the present invention, and in particular is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of a system administrator designating a maximum number of printing devices to be supported, wherein a print queue is not created for a printing device once an existing number of print queues has reached the designated maximum number.

In this regard, page 8 of the Office Action concedes that neither White, Richter, nor the AAPA disclose that a system administrator designates a maximum number of printing devices to be supported, or that a print queue is not created for a printing device once an existing number of print queues has reached the designated maximum number.

Nevertheless, the Office Action relies on Bellucco for this feature.

As understood by Applicants, Bellucco discloses a first document job server which communicates with a second document job server. See Bellucco, Abstract. More specifically, a local print server builds print queues that are configured to transport job copies to a remote server. See Bellucco, Column 6, lines 49 to 58. Since queues built in the local print server are built dynamically, the number of queues that can be created is limited only by the amount of available RAM in the memory pools of the local print server. See Bellucco, Column 6, lines 58 to 61.

However, Bellucco does not mention any role for a system administrator, much less that it is the role of the system administrator to designate a maximum number of printing devices to be supported. Bellucco also does not mention that a print queue is not created once the designated maximum number has been reached. Since Bellucco does not disclose a role for a system administrator (indeed, Bellucco is not seen to disclose a system administrator at all), it is not seen how Bellucco can possibly disclose or suggest the features claimed by Applicants.

Nonetheless, pages 8 and 9 of the Office Action assert that

"Bellucco discloses the number of queue is limited by the amount of available memory (RAM) available in the server (refer to Col 6, Lines 55-65), and each queue is associated with associated with [sic] one or more printing device (refer to Col 4, Lines 55-61). Therefore, it is obvious that system administrators designates a maximum number of printing queue according to maximum of printing devices be supported by the server (amount of RAM available to support the number of printing devices and print queue)."

In this regard, it is not understood how a physical limitation based on an amount of available RAM, as stated in Bellucco, can disclose or suggest the designation by a system administrator of a maximum number of printing devices to be supported. It is further not seen how Bellucco's RAM-based limitation on the number of print queues could possibly disclose or suggest non-creation of a print queue for a printing device once an existing number of print queues has reached the administrator-designated maximum number.

In fact, as seen by Applicants, Bellucco explicitly states that there is only one limitation on the number of queues, and that limitation is a RAM-based limitation and not an administrator-designated limitation:

"Since the queue built in the local print server is built dynamically, the number of queues that can be created is only limited by the amount of available RAM in the memory pools of the local print server." Bellucco, Column 6, lines 58 to 61 (emphasis added).

Thus, Bellucco points out that the only limitation on a print queue number is the amount of memory available, and not any limit set externally. In contrast, the present invention allows a system administrator to externally limit a number of queues by designating a maximum number of devices to be supported, and this maximum number need not be related to the amount of available memory at all.

Accordingly, Bellucco is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of a system administrator designating a maximum number of printing devices to be

supported, wherein a print queue is not created for a printing device once an existing number of print queues has reached the designated maximum number.

Therefore, independent Claims 1, 29, 57 and 85 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Guzniczak
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 59,820

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1555305v1